

REMARKS

The applicant's remarks, below, are preceded by quotations of related comments of the examiner in small, boldface type.

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U. S. C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sezan et al. U. S. Patent No. 6,236,395 ('Sezan')

The applied reference has a common inventor with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U. S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U. S. C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U. S. C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Sezan discloses:

As to claims 1, 11, and 21, searching the media sources for content and metadata based on a search criteria; See 7:15-67; 8:1-30; 9:8-25; parsing the metadata from the sources; See 9:8-25; receiving user preference information from a user; See 5:10-31; 10:38-65; integrating the content and the metadata according to the user preference information and based on the result of the parsing; See 5:10-31; 9:8-25; 10:38-65; 12:1-67; 26:40-67; and displaying an integrated content concurrently on one or more user displays; See 27:1-48.

Claims 1, 11 and 21 have been amended so that all of the pending claims now recite the following (or similar) clauses: "receiving user preference information from a content service provider; integrating the content and the metadata according to the user preference information and based on the result of the parsing; sending the integrated content and metadata to a content service provider; and rendering the integrated content concurrently on one or more user displays."

The applicant disagrees with the examiner's assertion that Sezan discloses sending the integrated content and the metadata to the content service provider. Sezan only shows sending the integrated content and metadata to a graphical user interface or a display (see FIG. 2 and column 9 lines 9 to 26).

Apparently, in Sezan, the audiovisual system 16 is collocated with a user. For example, the system 16 is compared to a VCR, TiVo system, RePlayTV system, radio located in a home (See Background and column 9 line 34 to column 10 line 37). Nowhere does Sezan disclose or suggest having a system that sends the integrated content and metadata to the content service

provider. Sezan only discloses a content server provider sending content to system 16 (see FIG. 2).

As to claims 2, 12, and 22, providing the integrated content and the metadata to an information presenter; See 5:10-31; 9:8-25; 10:38-65; 12:1-67; 26:40-67; 27:148.

As to claims 3, 13, and 23, providing the integrated content and the metadata resulting from the parsing to a content service provider; See 5:10-31 ; 9:8-25; 10:38-65; 12:1-67; 26:40-67.

As to claims 4, 14, and 24, wherein the sources comprise television programs, Internet broadcasts, and worldwide web pages; See 11:6-21.

As to claims 5, 15, and 25, wherein a data description manager passes the metadata resulting from the parsing and an associated content to an information integrator using an extensible markup language (XML); See 14:41-67.

As to claims 6, 16, and 26, wherein a data description manager passes the metadata resulting from the parsing and an associated content to an information integrator via an Application Programming Interface (API); See 12:48-55.

As to claims 7, 17, and 27, wherein the content is associated with one or more metadata descriptions; See 5:10-31; 9:8-25; 10:38-65; 12:1-67; 26:40-67.

As to claims 8, 18, and 28, wherein a multi-modal analysis engine creates the metadata description; See Figs. 2-3, and 13; 5:10-31; 9:8-25; 10:38-65; 12:1-67; 26:40-67.

As to claims 9, 19, and 29, wherein the multi-modal analysis engine comprises a video analyzer, an audio analyzer, and a digital analyzer; See Figs. 2-3 and 13, 5:10-31; 9:8-25; 10:38-65; 12:1-67; 26:40-67.

As to claims 10, 20, and 30, storing the integrated content for access at anytime by the user; see Figs. 2-3, and 13; 5:10-31; 9:8-25; 10:38-65; 12:1-67; 26:40-67.

The dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as the claims on which they depend.

Claims 1-5, 7-15, 21-25, and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sull et al. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0069218 ('Sull').

Sull discloses:

As to claims 1, 11, and 21, searching the media sources for content and metadata based on a search criteria; See Abstract; [0162-164]; [0174-0175]; [0325]; [0465]; [0474-0475]; parsing the metadata from the sources; See Abstract; [0162-164]; [0174-0175]; [0325]; [0465]; [0474-0475]; receiving user preference information from a user; See Abstract; [0162-164]; [0174-0175]; [0325]; [0465]; [0474-0475]; integrating the content and the metadata according to the user preference information and based on the result of the parsing; See Abstract; [0162-164]; [0174-0175]; [0325]; [0465]; [0474-0475]; and displaying an integrated content concurrently on one or more user displays; See Figs. 2-3; Abstract; [0162-164]; [0174-0175]; [0325]; [0465]; [0474-0475].

The applicant disagrees with the examiner's assertion that Sull discloses providing the integrated content and metadata to a content service provider. Sull only shows sending content to a graphical user interface or a display (see FIG. 1 and column 9 lines 9 to 26).

Apparently, in Sull, the system can be implemented at a server or a client (FIG. 53 and [161]). Yet, nowhere in Sull is it disclosed or suggested that the integrated content and metadata are sent to a content service provider.

As to claims 2, 12, and 22, providing the integrated content and the metadata to an information presenter; See Figs. 2-3; Abstract; [0162-164]; [0174-0175]; [0325]; [0465]; [0474-0475].

As to claims 3, 13, and 23, providing the integrated content and the metadata resulting from the parsing to a content service provider; See Figs. 2-3; Abstract; [0162-164]; [0174-0175]; [0325]; [0465]; [0474-0475].

As to claims 4, 14, and 24, wherein the sources comprise television programs, Internet broadcasts, and worldwide web pages; See Figs. 2-3; Abstract; [0162-164]; [0174-0175]; [0325]; [0465]; [0474-0475].

As to claims 5, 15, and 25, wherein a data description manager passes the metadata resulting from the parsing and an associated content to an information integrator using an extensible markup language (XML); See Figs. 2-3; Abstract; [0162-164]; [0174-0175]; [0325]; [0465]; [0474-0475].

As to claims 7, 17, and 27, wherein the content is associated with one or more metadata descriptions; See Figs. 2-3; Abstract; [0162-164]; [0174-0175]; [0325]; [0465]; [0474-0475].

As to claims 8, 18, and 28, wherein a multi-modal analysis engine creates the metadata description; See Figs. 2-3; Abstract; [0162-164]; [0174-0175]; [0325]; [0465]; [0474-0475].

As to claims 9, 19, and 29, wherein the multi-modal analysis engine comprises a video analyzer, an audio analyzer, and a digital analyzer; See Figs. 2-3; Abstract; [0162-164]; [0174-0175]; [0325]; [0465]; [0474-0475].

As to claims 10, 20, and 30, storing the integrated content for access at anytime by the user; See Figs. 2-3; Abstract; [0162-164]; [0174-0175]; [0325]; [0465]; [0474-0475].

The dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as the claims on which they depend.

The fact that the applicant has addressed certain positions of the examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes other stated positions of the examiner. The fact that the applicant has made arguments for patentability of claims does not mean that the applicant concedes that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims or other claims.